

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 09/242,343	Applicant(s) VOLLENBROICH ET AL.	
	Examiner Zachariah Lucas	Art Unit 1648	

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) Zachariah Lucas.

(3) _____.

(2) MaryAnne Armstrong.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 28 April 2004

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

NA

Claims discussed:

1

Prior art documents discussed:

Itokawa et al. and Weislow et al.,

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner indicated that, while claim 1 did not appear allowable as amended in the February 10, 2004 Response, the claim would be allowable if the claim was amended such that the contacting step was limited to embodiments wherein the time of contact was limited to a period - - up to 2 hours- - .

The Examiner also indicated that the term "isolated" should be inserted at the beginning of claim 11 such that the claim does not read on surfactins that are still in the bacteria from which they may be isolated (i.e. such that the claims do not read on a product of nature under 35 U.S.C. 101).

The Examiner also suggested:

the amendment of claim 3 such that it states that the cyclic lipopeptide - - is a naturally occurring lipopeptide, or is a chemically synthesized lipopeptide, or is a lipopeptide produced or modified by genetic engineering.- -;

the correction of claim 9 such that it reads - - lipid-enveloped- - rather than "lipid-developed"; and

the insertion of the term - - wherein- - after the comma in line 1 of claim 18.

The Applicant accepted the changes indicated above, and indicated that an Examiner's Amendment would be acceptable.